

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-17 are pending in the Application and are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-14 and 16-17 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of subject matter.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 17 are independent.

OBJECTIONS

On page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to because of informalities. Specifically, page 9, lines 3-4 discloses, “in the illustrated embodiment, a person with application-level or system-level super user privilege maintains list 54”; and lines 9-10 discloses, “in the illustrated embodiment, a person with application-level or system-level super user privilege maintains list 58.” The Office Action requests clarification on how 54 and 58 could maintain identical lists. Applicant contends that lists 54 and 58 are not identical. List 54 contains names of trusted individuals, while list 58 contains “group names presumed to be user groups and untrusted, based on the name itself,” as clearly shown at least in FIG. 1 and page 8, line 20; page 9, lines 3-4.

Additionally, the Office Action further objects to page 10, lines 12-14, which discloses, “After steps 110 and 112, the privilege checking program 50 loops back to repeat the foregoing analysis and report for the next group.” The loop was not shown in FIG. 2A. Applicant has amended FIG. 2A and the last paragraph on page 9 to include the loop.

The Office Action further objects to page 11, line 8, which discloses, “The operating system obtains these names from the master configuration file 50.” However, FIG. 1 indicates

that the master configuration file is 22. Applicant has amended the last paragraph of page 11 to correct this typographical error.

The Office Action further objects to “program” 60 of FIG. 1, which is disclosed on pages 11-12 as “application authority manager program.” Applicant has amended FIG. 1 to change the name of “program” 60 to “application authority manager program” 60.

Applicant respectfully asserts that all objections have been addressed and resolved.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 5, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as being unclear. Specifically, the Office Action states that the Examiner could not understand exactly what functions the third program instructions of Claims 1 and 11, and the fourth program instructions of Claims 3, 5 and 14 perform.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 5, 11 and 14 to more clearly and distinctly recite the claimed features. Specifically, the preamble of independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the function of the computer program product is to determine “that a group has been improperly assigned a privilege level higher than user level privilege.” Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the third program instructions “determine whether the group has a group name on a second list, the second list including group names generally used for a group having user level privilege, and if so, generate a report indicating that the group has a group

name generally used for a group with user level privilege, such that members of the group are revealed as potentially not trusted,” (emphasis added). Applicant believes that Claim 1, as amended, clearly expresses the function of the third program instructions and highlights the differences between the first list, which contains names of trusted *individuals*, and the second list, which contains *group* names that are generally used for groups having *user level* privileges (e.g., “staff,” “users,” and “nobody”). *See* page 9, line 4. Applicant believes that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Claim 1 has been overcome and kindly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 3, which depends from Claim 1, has been amended to clarify that the fourth program instructions determine “whether the *group* has a group name not included on a *third* list, the third list including group names generally used for a group having *a privilege level higher than user level privilege*, and if so, generate a report indicating that the group has a group name not on the third list, such that members of the group are revealed as potentially not trusted,” (emphasis added). Applicant believes that Claim 3, as amended, clearly expresses the function of the fourth program instructions and highlights the differences between the *second* list, which contains group names that are generally used for groups having *user level* privileges, and the *third* list, which contains *group* names that are generally used for groups having *a privilege level higher than user level privilege* (e.g., “root,” “system,” and “admin”). *See* page 8, lines 25-27. Applicant believes that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Claim 3 has also been overcome and kindly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 5, which also depends from Claim 1, has been amended to clarify that “responsive to determining that the *group* has a group name on the *second* list,” the fourth

program instructions, “determine whether each **member** of the group is on the **first** list.”

Applicant believes that Claim 5, as amended, clearly expresses the function of the fourth program instructions and overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, Applicant kindly requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 11 has also been amended to recite an alternate computer program product for determining “that a group has been improperly assigned a privilege level higher than user level privilege.” The language expressing the function of the third program instructions of Claim 11 has been amended to clearly recite that the third program instructions “determine whether the group has a group name **not** on a **second** list, the second list including group names generally used for a group having **a privilege level higher than user level privilege**, and if so, generate a report indicating that the group has a group name not generally used for a group having a privilege level higher than user level privilege, such that the members of the group are revealed as potentially not trusted,” (emphasis added). Applicant believes that Claim 11, as amended, clearly expresses the function of the third program instructions and highlights the differences between the first list, which contains names of trusted **individuals**, and the second list, which contains **group** names that are generally used for groups having **a privilege level higher than user level privilege**. Applicant wishes to point out that the second list in Claim 11 is not the same as the second list in Claim 1. Applicant believes that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Claim 11 has been overcome and kindly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 14, which depends from Claim 11, has been amended to clarify that “responsive to determining that the **group** has a group name on the **second** list,” the fourth program instructions “determine whether each **member** of the group is on the **first** list.”

Applicant believes that Claim 14, as amended, clearly expresses the function of the fourth program instructions and overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, Applicant kindly requests this rejection also be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. AAPA in view of Ashland

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter “AAPA”) in view of United States Patent No. 7,219,234 B1, issued to Ashland, *et al.* (hereinafter “Ashland”). As an initial matter, Claim 15 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant asserts that neither the AAPA nor Ashland, whether considered separately or in combination, teach or suggest the features of amended independent Claim 1. A feature of amended independent Claim 1 is that the computer program product includes first program instructions that “compare each member within the group to a *first list*, the first list including *names of trusted individuals*” and third program instructions that “determine whether the group has a group name on a *second list*, the second list including *group names generally used for a group with user level privilege.*” These features are not taught disclosed or anticipated by the AAPA or Ashland, either standing alone or in combination.

The Office Action characterizes the AAPA as teaching essentially all the elements of Claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing a “computer program product for determining if any of a

plurality of groups may have an improper actual level of privilege, said computer program product comprising: a computer readable medium, and wherein said first, second and third program instructions are recorded on said medium.” The Office Action relies upon Ashland to teach this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization.

As the Examiner had expressed confusion over the language of Claim 1 in both an interview conducted on 1/30/2008, as well as in the Office Action (*see* page 4), the Applicant has amended Claim 1 solely for the purpose of more clearly and distinctly reciting the claimed invention. No additional limitations have been added. Specifically, amended Claim 1 is directed to a computer program product for determining that a group has been improperly assigned a privilege level higher than user level privilege. The computer program product comprises three sets of program instructions. The first program instructions compare each member within the group to a first list which includes names of trusted individuals. The second program instructions determine whether the group includes at least one member not on the first list, and if so, generate a report identifying said at least one member not on the first list and the group in which said at least one member is a member. The third program instructions determine whether the group has a group name on a second list which includes group names generally used for a group with user level privilege, and if so, generate a report indicating that the group has a group name generally used for a group having user level privilege, such that members of the group are revealed as potentially not trusted.

The Office Action characterizes the AAPA as teaching the features of “first program instructions to compare members within each of said groups to a *list of trusted individuals*” and “third program instructions to determine if any group with an actual privilege level higher than

user level privilege has a group name on a *list of group names generally used for a group with user level privilege*,” (emphasis added). In support of this position, the Office Action cites to page 2, lines 26-28, which states, “An administrator occasionally reviewed the members of privileged groups to determine if the administrator knew, through *personal knowledge*, that the members were all trusted individuals,” (emphasis added). Additionally, the Office Action cites page 2, lines 19-20, which states, “The system administrator would review the privilege level for each group to determine if the group names typically used for user groups (*as known by the system administrator*) have higher than “user level privilege,” (emphasis added).

The procedures referenced in the AAPA do not involve comparing members to a *list of trusted individuals*, nor do they involve determining if a group with a privilege level higher than user level is on a *list of group names* generally used for a group with user level privilege. The procedures in the AAPA rely exclusively on the general knowledge of the system administrator. There is no mention of any type of list being referenced at all. In fact, this lack of standards is one of the problems that the AAPA specifically references as needing to be solved, as indicated by the statement, “Also, some system administrators did not know which group names were typically used for unprivileged users.” (page 2, lines 30-31). The methods discussed in the AAPA, not only fail to reveal each and every element of claim 1 as asserted in the Office Action, they are also insufficient and inferior to those claimed in the present invention as the AAPA methods yielded inconsistent and often inaccurate results.

Additionally, the Office Action contends that Ashland discloses “a computer program product for determining if any of a plurality of groups may have an improper actual level of privilege.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. Ashland teaches a method and

system for controlling access to system resources by *assigning* privilege levels to different groups or users, but it does not teach a method for determining that previously assigned privilege levels are improper. (See Ashland, col. 2, line 26 – col. 3, line 48). Therefore, as neither the AAPA nor Ashland, standing alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 6, 11, 16 and 17

Independent Claims 6, 11, 16 and 17 also recite features similar to those discussed above in relation to Claim1. Specifically, each of independent Claims 6, 11, 16 and 17 include comparing members of a group or group names to one or more predetermined lists, thereby eliminating the need to rely upon personal knowledge. Thus, the arguments presented above in relation to Claim 1, apply equally to Independent Claims 6, 11, 16 and 17. Applicant earnestly solicits withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) and reconsideration of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-14

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-14 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

2. Kuhn in view of Clark

On page 13 of the Office Action, Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Kuhn” (U.S. 6,023,765) in view of Clark *et al.* (U.S. 7,237,119 B2, referred as “Clark” hereinafter).

Independent Claim 1

Applicant asserts that neither the Kuhn nor Clark, whether considered separately or in combination, teach or suggest the features of amended independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 recites a “computer program product for determining that a **group** has been *improperly assigned* a privilege level higher than user level privilege,” and third program instructions that “determine whether the group has a group name on a second list, the second list including **group names generally used for a group with user level privilege**,” (emphasis added). These features are not taught disclosed or anticipated by Kuhn or Clark, either standing alone or in combination.

The Office Action characterizes Kuhn as disclosing a “computer program product for determining if any of a plurality of groups may have an improper actual level of privilege.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment. In support of this position, the Office Action cites to col. 1, lines 23-29, which states, “assuming individual persons are first identified to the system in a satisfactory manner, their access to documents, programs, facilities, and other “objects” within the protected computer system is then controlled by a security system simply by comparing the user’s name against a list of names of persons entitled to access the given object.” Kuhn discloses a method for determining whether an **individual is allowed access** to a given

object before permitting the individual to access the object. Kuhn does not disclose a method for determining whether a **group** has been *improperly assigned a privilege level higher than user level privilege*. Neither Kuhn nor Clark, standing alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest this feature.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that Kuhn discloses program instructions to “determine if any group with an actual privilege level higher than user level privilege has a group name on a list of group names generally used for a group with user level privilege.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to Kuhn, a subject can only execute a privilege if the subject has been selected or assigned and active role. In other words, Kuhn discloses verifying that a subject has a privilege level that authorizes access. In contrast, the claimed feature recites determining whether a group that has a privilege level **higher** than user level privilege actually has a group name on a list of group names generally used for a group with **user** level privilege. Kuhn does not disclose anything at all about determining that a group with a higher privilege level than user level has a name generally used for a group with user level privilege.

Neither Kuhn nor Clark, standing alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest each and every feature of Claim 1. Thus, applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16

Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16 also recite features similar to those discussed above in relation to Claim 1. Specifically, each of independent Claims 6, 11 and 16 include comparing members of a group or group names to one or more predetermined lists, thereby eliminating the need to rely upon personal knowledge. Additionally each claim recites determining whether a

group that has a privilege level higher than user level privilege actually has a group name on a list of group names generally used for a group with user level privilege. Thus, the arguments presented above in relation to Claim 1, apply equally to Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16.

Applicant earnestly solicits withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) and reconsideration of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-14

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-14 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

3. *Kuhn in view of Morris*

On page 22 of the Office Action, Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Kuhn” (U.S. 6,023,765) in view of Morris *et al.* (EP 1 124 184 A2, referred as “Morris” hereinafter).

Independent 17 also recites features similar to those discussed above in relation to Claim 1. Specifically, Claim 17 recites determining whether a group that has a privilege level higher than user level privilege actually has a group name on a list of group names generally used for a group with user level privilege. Thus, the arguments presented above in relation to Claim 1,

apply equally to Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16. Applicant earnestly solicits withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) and reconsideration of these claims.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 1-14 and 16-17 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 090457.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2008

By: /Alan M. Weisberg/
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No.: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 68786
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

99775